

The People are further aware that during the time he/she has been employed by the New York City Police Department, that he has been named as a defendant or co-defendant in several state lawsuits.

1. Jones v. City of New York, et al., 26908/2011, filed in Kings County Supreme Court, for which the disposition is unknown.

In the cases that settled, a stipulation of settlement and order of dismissal with prejudice was filed with the respective court, indicating, in sum and substance, that nothing in the settlement shall be construed as an admission or concession of liability by any of the defendants or the City of New York regarding any of the allegations made by the plaintiffs in their complaints, or that any of the plaintiffs' rights under the Federal or New York Constitutions or Statutes had been violated.

A review of the officer's Central Personnel Index (CPI) revealed the following:

1. On June 10, 2013, he had a substantiated departmental investigation for an incomplete memobook and was issued a schedule "B" command discipline.
2. On February 12, 2018, he had a substantiated departmental investigation for an invoice discrepancy and for an incorrect/inaccurate voucher for which he received verbal instructions.
3. On April 4, 2019, he had a substantiated departmental investigation for violation of departmental rules for which no disciplinary action is noted.
4. On July 8, 2019, he had a substantiated departmental investigation for an invoice discrepancy and for an incorrect/inaccurate voucher for which he received a schedule "A" command discipline.

A review of the officer's CCRB history revealed the following:

1. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
2. On April 17, 2002, he had a substantiated CCRB complaint for misconduct.
3. On May 1, 2002, he had a substantiated CCRB complaint for an improper frisk, stop, search and for failure to provide his shield number. He was found guilty at departmental trial and was given verbal instruction.
4. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]